Exhibit 4

Wolf Haldenstein

PROVIDING EXEMPLARY LEGAL SERVICES SINCE 1888

FIRM RESUME

Founded in 1888, Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz LLP is a full service law firm specializing in complex litigation in federal and state courts nationwide. The firm's practice includes litigation, both hourly and contingent, in securities, antitrust, wage & hour, consumer fraud, false marketing, ERISA, and general and commercial matters, general representation in REIT & partnership, whistleblower, false claim, trust & estate, corporate investigation, and white collar matters, and FINRA arbitration. The Firm has a particular specialty in complex class action and other representative litigation – including investor, shareholder, antitrust, ERISA, consumer, employee, and biotechnology matters – under both federal and state law.

Wolf Haldenstein's total practice approach distinguishes it from other firms. Our longstanding tradition of a close attorney/client relationship ensures that each one of our clients receives prompt, individual attention and does not become lost in an institutional bureaucracy. Our team approach is at the very heart of Wolf Haldenstein's practice. All of our lawyers are readily available to all of our clients and to each other. The result of this approach is that we provide our clients with an efficient legal team having the broad perspective, expertise and experience required for any matter at hand. We are thus able to provide our clients with cost effective and thorough counsel focused on our clients' overall goals.

270 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10016 TELEPHONE: 212-545-4600 TELECOPIER: 212-545-4653 WWW.WHAFH.COM

SYMPHONY TOWERS 750 B STREET, SUITE 2770 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101 TELEPHONE: 619-239-4599

TELECOPIER: 619-234-4599

70 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, IL 60602
TELEPHONE: 312-984-0000

TELECOPIER: 312-214-3110



PROVIDING EXEMPLARY LEGAL SERVICES SINCE 1888

THE FIRM

Wolf Haldenstein has been recognized by state and federal courts throughout the country as being highly experienced in complex litigation, particularly with respect to securities, consumer, ERISA, FLSA and state overtime and expense deductions, and antitrust class actions and shareholder rights litigation.

Among its colleagues in the plaintiffs' bar, as well as among its adversaries in the defense bar, Wolf Haldenstein is known for the high ability of its attorneys, and the exceptionally high quality of its written and oral advocacy.

The nature of the Firm's activities in both individual and representative litigation is extremely broad. In addition to a large case load of securities fraud and other investor class actions, Wolf Haldenstein has represented classes of corn and rice farmers in connection with the devaluation of their crops; contact lens purchasers for contact lens manufacturers' violations of the antitrust laws; merchants compelled to accept certain types of debit cards; insurance policyholders for insurance companies' deceptive sales practices; victims of unlawful strip searches under the civil rights laws; and various cases involving violations of Internet users' on-line privacy rights.

The Firm's experience in class action securities litigation, in particular public shareholder rights under state law and securities fraud claims arising under the federal securities laws and regulations is particularly extensive. The Firm was one of the lead or other primary counsel in securities class action cases that have recouped billions of dollars on behalf of investor classes, in stockholder rights class actions that have resulted in billions of dollars in increased merger consideration to shareholder classes, and in derivative litigation that has recovered billions of dollars for corporations.

Its pioneering efforts in difficult or unusual areas of securities or investor protection laws include: groundbreaking claims that have been successfully brought under the Investment Company Act of 1940 regarding fiduciary responsibilities of investment companies and their advisors toward their shareholders; claims under ERISA involving fiduciary duties of ERISA trustees who are also insiders in possession of adverse information regarding their fund's primary stockholdings; the fiduciary duties of the directors of Delaware corporations in connection with change of control transactions; the early application of the fraud-on-the-market theory to claims against public accounting firms in connection with their audits of publicly traded corporations; and the application of federal securities class certification standards to state law claims often thought to be beyond the reach of class action treatment.



JUDICIAL COMMENDATIONS

Wolf Haldenstein has repeatedly received favorable judicial recognition. The following representative judicial comments over the past decade indicate the high regard in which the Firm is held:

- In re Empire State Realty Trust, Inc. Investor Litig., No. 650607/2012 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co.) On May 2, 2013, Justice O. Peter Sherwood praised the Firm in its role as chair of the committee of co-lead counsel as follows: "It is apparent to me, having presided over this case, that class counsel has performed in an excellent manner, and you have represented your clients quite well. You should be complimented for that." In awarding attorneys' fees, the Court stated that the fee was "intended to reward class counsel handsomely for the very good result achieved for the Class, assumption of the high risk of Plaintiffs prevailing and the efficiency of effort that resulted in the settlement of the case at an early stage without protracted motion practice." May 17, 2013 slip. op. at 5 (citations omitted).
- Roberts v. Tishman Speyer, 13 N.Y.3d 270 (N.Y. 2009) On April 9, 2013, Justice Richard B. Lowe III praised the Firm's efforts as follows: "[W]hen you have challenging cases, the one thing you like to ask for is that the legal representation on both sides rise to that level. Because when you have lawyers who are professionals, who are confident, who are experienced, each of you know that each side has a job to do [. . . .] I want to tell you that I am very satisfied with your performance and with your, quite frankly, tenacity on both sides. And it took six years, but look at the history of the litigation. There were two appeals all of the way to the Court of Appeals [. . . .] And then look at the results. I mean, there are dissents in the Court of Appeals, so that shows you the complexity of the issues that were presented in this litigation [. . . .] [I]t shows you effort that went into this and the professionalism that was exhibited [. . . .] So let me just again express my appreciation to both sides."
- *K.J. Egleston L.P. v. Heartland Industrial Partners, et al.*, 2:06-13555 (E.D. Mich.) where the Firm was Lead Counsel, Judge Rosen, at the June 7, 2010 final approval hearing, praised the Firm for doing "an outstanding job of representing [its] clients," and further commented that "the conduct of all counsel in this case and the result they have achieved for all of the parties confirms that they deserve the national recognition they enjoy."



- Klein, et al. v. Ryan Beck Holdings, Inc., et al., 06-cv-3460 (DAB) (S.D.N.Y. 2010) where the Firm was Lead Counsel, Judge Deborah A. Batts described the Firm's successful establishment of a settlement fund as follows: "[a] miracle that there is a settlement fund at all." Judge Batts continued: "As I said earlier, there is no question that the litigation is complex and of a large and, if you will, pioneering magnitude ..." (Emphasis added).
- Parker Friedland v. Iridium World Communications, Ltd., 99-1002 (D.D.C.) where the Firm was co-lead counsel, Judge Laughrey said (on October 16, 2008), "[a]ll of the attorneys in this case have done an outstanding job, and I really appreciate the quality of work that we had in our chambers as a result of this case."
- In re Dynamic Random Access Memory Antitrust Litigation, MDL-02-1486 (N.D. Cal.) where the Firm was co-lead counsel, Judge Hamilton said (on August 15, 2007), "I think I can conclude on the basis with my five years with you all, watching this litigation progress and seeing it wind to a conclusion, that the results are exceptional. The percentages, as you have outlined them, do put this [case] in one of the upper categories of results of this kind of [antitrust] class action. I am aware of the complexity . . . I thought that you all did an exceptionally good job of bringing to me only those matters that really required the Court's attention. You did an exceptionally good job at organizing and managing the case, assisting me in management of the case. There was excellent coordination between all the various different plaintiffs' counsel with your group and the other groups that are part of this litigation. . . . So my conclusion is the case was well litigated by both sides, well managed as well by both sides."
- In re Comdisco Sec. Litigation, 01 C 2110 (N.D. Ill. July 14, 2005) Judge Milton Shadur observed: "It has to be said . . . that the efforts that have been extended [by Wolf Haldenstein] on behalf of the plaintiff class in the face of these obstacles have been exemplary. And in my view [Wolf Haldenstein] reflected the kind of professionalism that the critics of class actions . . . are never willing to recognize. . . . I really cannot speak too highly of the services rendered by class counsel in an extraordinary difficult situation."



RECENT NOTEWORTHY RESULTS

Wolf Haldenstein's performance in representative litigation has repeatedly resulted in favorable results for its clients. The Firm has helped recover <u>billions of dollars</u> on behalf of its clients in the cases listed below. Recent examples include the following:

- In re Genetically Modified Rice Litigation, MDL 1811 (E.D. Mo.) Wolf Haldenstein represented U.S. rice farmers in this landmark action against Bayer A.G. and its global affiliates, achieving a global recovery of \$750 million. The case arose from the contamination of the nation's long grain rice crop by Bayer's experimental and unapproved genetically modified Liberty Link rice.
- Roberts v. Tishman Speyer, 13 N.Y.3d 270 (N.Y. 2009) a class action brought on behalf of over 27,500 current and former tenants of New York City's iconic Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village housing complexes. On April 9, 2013, Justice Richard B. Lowe III of the New York Supreme Court finally approved settlement of the action, which totals over \$173 million, sets aside \$68.75 million in damages, re-regulates the apartments at issue, and sets preferential rents for the units that will save tenants significant monies in the future. The settlement also enables the tenants to retain an estimated \$105 million in rent savings they enjoyed between 2009 and 2012. The settlement is by many magnitudes the largest tenant settlement in United States history.
- In re Empire State Realty Trust, Inc. Investor Litig., Index No. 650607/2012 The firm served as Chair of the Executive Committee of Co-Lead Counsel for the Plaintiffs in a class action settlement finally approved on May 2, 2013 that provides for the establishment of a \$55 million settlement fund for investors, in addition to substantial tax deferral benefits estimated to be in excess of \$100 million.
- American International Group Consolidated Derivative Litigation, Civil Action No. 769-VCS (Del. Ch.) The Firm acted as co-lead counsel and the settlement addressed claims alleging that the D&O Defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the Company and otherwise committed wrongdoing to the detriment of AIG in connection with various allegedly fraudulent schemes during the 1999-2005 time period.
- In re Bank of America Corp. Securities, Derivative, and Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) Litigation, Master File No. 09 MD 2058 (S.D.N.Y.) (firm was co-lead counsel in parallel derivative action pending in Delaware (In Re Bank of



America Stockholder Derivative Litigation, C.A. No. 4307-CS (Del. Ch.)) (increase of settlement cash recovery from \$20 million to \$62.5 million).

- The Investment Committee of the Manhattan and Bronx Service Transit Operating Authority Pension Plan v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., 1:09-cv-04408-SAS (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$150 million).
- In re Tremont Sec. Law, State Law and Insurance Litig., No. 08-civ-11117 (TPG) (SDNY) (class recovered \$100 million). The firm was court-appointed co-lead counsel in the Insurance Action, 08 Civ. 557, and represented a class of persons who purchased or otherwise acquired Variable Universal Life ("VUL") insurance policies or Deferred Variable Annuity ("DVA") policies issued by Tremont International Insurance Limited or Argus International Life Bermuda Limited from May 10, 1994 December 11, 2008 to the extent the investment accounts of those policies were exposed to the massive Ponzi scheme orchestrated by Bernard L. Madoff through one or more Rye funds.
- In re Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation, 21 MC 92 (SAS) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$586 million). Wolf Haldenstein served as Co-Lead Counsel of one of the largest securities fraud cases in history. Despite the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit's decision to vacate the district court's class certification decision, on remand, counsel for plaintiffs were able to press on to a settlement on April 1, 2009, ultimately recovering in excess of a half-billion dollars.



FIRM PRACTICE AREAS

CLASS ACTION LITIGATION

Wolf Haldenstein is a leader in class and derivative action litigation and is currently or has been the court-appointed lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or executive committee member in some of the largest and most significant class action and derivative action lawsuits in the United States. For example, the class action *Roberts v. Tishman Speyer*, 13 N.Y.3d 270 (N.Y. 2009) was recently described by a sitting member of the U.S. House of Representatives as the greatest legal victory for tenants in her lifetime. In *Roberts*, the Firm obtained a victory in the New York Court of Appeals requiring the reregulation of thousands of apartment units in the Stuyvesant Town complex in Manhattan, New York. Many of the firm's other successful results are summarized within.

PRIVATE ACTIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL INVESTORS

In addition to its vast class action practice, the Firm also regularly represents institutional clients such as public funds, investment funds, limited partnerships, and qualified institutional buyers in private actions. The Firm has represented institutional clients in non-class federal and state actions concerning a variety of matters, including private placements, disputes with investment advisors, and disputes with corporate management.

The Firm has also acted as special counsel to investors' committees in efforts to assert and advance the investors' interests without resorting to litigation. For example, the Firm served as Counsel to the Courtyard by Marriott Limited Partners Committee for several years in its dealings with Host Marriott Corporation, and as Special Counsel to the Windsor Park Properties 7 and 8 limited partners to insure the fairness of their liquidation transactions.

ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Wolf Haldenstein is a leader in antitrust and competition litigation. The Firm actively seeks to enforce the federal and state antitrust laws to protect and strengthen the rights and claims of businesses, organizations, Taft-Hartley funds, and consumers throughout the United States. To that end, Wolf Haldenstein commences large, often complex, antitrust and trade regulation class actions and other cases that target some of the most powerful and well-funded corporate interests in the world. Many of these interests exert strong influence over enforcement policy that is in the hands of elected officials, so that private enforcement provides the only true assurance that unfair and anticompetitive conduct will be duly scrutinized for compliance with the law. These



cases frequently bring to light concealed, unlawful behavior such as price fixing, monopolization, market allocation, monopoly leveraging, essential facilities, tying arrangements, vertical restraints, exclusive dealing, and refusals to deal. Wolf Haldenstein's Antitrust Practice Group has successfully prosecuted numerous antitrust cases and aggressively advocates remedies and restitution for businesses and investors wronged by violations of the antitrust laws. For example, in *In re DRAM Antitrust Litigation*, No. 02-cv-1486 (PJH) (N.D. Cal.) the firm successfully prosecuted an antitrust case resulting in a \$315 million recovery. Many of the firm's successful results are summarized within.

Wolf Haldenstein attorneys currently serve as lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or as executive committee members in some of the largest and most significant antitrust class action lawsuits.

BIOTECHNOLOGY AND AGRICULTURAL LITIGATION

Wolf Haldenstein is a leader in biotechnology and agricultural litigation. The firm has represented U.S. row crop farmers and others harmed by crop supply contamination, price fixing of genetically-modified crop seeds, and false claims and representations relating to purportedly "organic" products. The firm has prosecuted actions in these fields against domestic and international biotechnology and crop science companies under the federal and state antitrust laws, consumer protection and deceptive trade practice statues, and the common law. As a leader in this field, Wolf Haldenstein pioneered approaches now commonly used in these types of cases, including the use of futures-based efficient market analyses to fashion damages models relating to the underlying commodity crops. The firm has served or is currently serving as lead or colead counsel in some of the most significant biotechnology and agricultural class actions pending or litigated in the United States. For example, in In re Genetically Modified Rice Litigation, MDL 1811 (E.D. Mo.) the firm prosecuted a multidistrict product liability litigation brought on behalf of United States long-grain rice farmers that ultimately settled in July 2011 for \$750 million. Many of the firm's other successful results are summarized within.

OVERTIME AND COMPENSATION CLASS ACTIONS

Wolf Haldenstein is a leader class action litigation on behalf of employees who have not been paid overtime or other compensation they are entitled to receive, or have had improper deductions taken from their compensation. These claims under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act and state labor laws allege improper failure to pay overtime and other wages, and improper deductions from compensation for various company



expenses. Wolf Haldenstein has served as lead or co-lead counsel, or other similar lead role, in some of the most significant overtime class actions pending in the United States, and has recovered hundreds of millions of dollars in recovered wages for its clients. For example, in *LaVoice v. Citigroup Global Markets, Inc.*, Case No. C 07-801 (CW) (N.D. Cal.)) a \$108 million settlement was secured for the class. Many of the firm's other successful wage and hour results are summarized within.

OTHER SUBSTANTIAL RECOVERIES IN CLASS ACTION AND DERIVATIVE CASES IN WHICH WOLF HALDENSTEIN WAS LEAD COUNSEL OR HAD ANOTHER SIGNIFICANT ROLE

- *In re Beacon Associates Litigation*, Master File No. 09 Civ. 0777 (LBS) (S.D.N.Y.) (**\$219 million** settlement in this and related action).
- Roberts v. Tishman Speyer, No. 100956/2007 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty.) (\$173 Million settlement).
- In re Mutual Fund Investment Litigation, MDL No. 1586 (D. Md.) (derivative counsel in consolidated cases against numerous mutual fund companies involved in market timing resulting in class/derivative settlements totaling more than \$300 million).
- *Inland Western Securities Litigation*, Case No. 07 C 6174 (N.D. Ill.) (settlement value of shares valued between **\$61.5 million** and **\$90 million**).
- *In re Direxion Shares ETF Trust,* No. 09-Civ-8011 (KBF) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **\$8 million**).
- *In re BankAmerica Corp. Securities Litigation,* MDL Docket No. 1264 (JFN) (E.D. Mo.) (class recovered **\$490 million**).
- *In re Dynamic Random Access Memory Antitrust Litigation,* (MD-02 1486 (N.D. Cal.) (class recovered **\$325 million**).
- *In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation,* Civ. No. 00-473-A (E.D. Va.) (class recovered **\$160 million** in cash and securities).
- Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Cos., 94 Civ. 2373, 94 Civ. 2546 (S.D.N.Y.) (securities fraud) (class recovered **\$116.5 million** in cash).
- In re Starlink Corn Products Liability Litigation, (N.D. Ill.) (class recovered \$110 million).



- In Computer Associates 2002 Class Action Sec. Litigation, 2:02-CV-1226 (E.D.N.Y.) (\$130 million settlement in this and two related actions).
- In re Sepracor Inc. Securities Litigation, Civ. No. 02-12338 (MEL) (D. Mass.) (classes recovered \$52.5 million).
- In re Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc., Securities Litigation, C.A. No. 03-10165-RWZ (D. Mass) (class recovered \$50 million).
- In re Iridium Securities Litigation, C.A. No. 99-1002 (D.D.C.) (class recovered \$43 million).
- In re J.P. Morgan Chase Securities Litigation, MDL No. 1783 (N.D. Ill.) (settlement providing for adoption of corporate governance principles relating to potential corporate transactions requiring shareholder approval).
- LaVoice v. Citigroup Global Markets, Inc., Case No. C 07-801 (CW) (N.D. Cal.)) (\$108 million settlement).
- Steinberg v. Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc., Case No. 06-cv-2628 (BEN) (S.D. Cal.) (\$50 million settlement).
- Poole v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc., Case No. CV-06-1657 (D. Or.) (\$43.5 million settlement).
- In re Wachovia Securities, LLC Wage and Hour Litigation, MDL No. 07-1807 DOC (C.D. Cal.) (\$39 million settlement).
- In re Wachovia Securities, LLC Wage and Hour Litigation (Prudential), MDL No. 07-1807 DOC (C.D. Cal.) (\$11 million settlement).
- Basile v. A.G. Edwards, Inc., 08-CV-00338-JAH-RBB (S.D. Cal.) (\$12 million settlement).
- Miguel Garcia, et al. v. Lowe's Home Center, Inc. et al. Case No. GIC 841120 (Barton) (Cal. Sup. Ct, San Diego) (co-lead, \$1.65 million settlement w/ average class member recovery of \$5,500, attorney fees and cost awarded separately).
- Neil Weinstein, et al. v. MetLife, Inc., et al. Case No. 3:06-cv-04444-SI (N.D.Cal) (co-lead, \$7.4 million settlement).



- *Creighton v. Oppenheimer,* Index No. 1:06 cv 04607 BSJ DCF (S.D.N.Y.) (\$2.3 million settlement).
- Klein v. Ryan Beck, 06-CV-3460 (DAB)(S.D.N.Y.) (\$1.3 million settlement).
- *In re American Pharmaceutical Partners, Inc. Shareholder Litigation,* Consolidated C.A. No. 1823-N (Del. Ch. Ct.) (\$14.3 million settlement).
- Egleston v. Collins and Aikman Corp., 06-cv-13555 (E.D. Mich.) (class recovered \$12 million).
- In re Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. Global Technology Fund Securities Litigation, 02 CV 7854 (JFK) (SDNY); and In re Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. Focus Twenty Fund Securities Litigation, 02 CV 10221 (JFK) (SDNY) (class recovered \$39 million in combined cases).
- In re CNL Hotels & Resorts, Inc. Securities Litigation, No. 6:04-cv-1231 (Orl-31) (class recovered \$35 million, and lawsuit also instrumental in \$225 million benefit to corporation).
- *In re Cablevision Systems Corp. Shareholder Derivative Litigation,* Master File No. 06-CV-4130-DGT-AKT (\$34.4 million recovery).
- *In re Monster Worldwide, Inc. Stock Option Derivative Litigation,* Master File No. 06cv4622 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$32 million recovery and corporate governance reforms).
- *Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp.,* Docket No. 98-1148 (S.D. Tex.) (class recovered \$29 million).
- *In re Arakis Energy Corporation Securities Litigation,* 95 CV 3431 (E.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **\$24 million**).
- *In re E.W. Blanche Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation,* Civ. No. 01-258 (D. Minn.) (class recovered **\$20 million**).
- *In re Globalstar Securities Litigation,* Case No. 01-CV-1748 (SHS) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered **\$20 million**).
- *In re Luxottica Group S.p.A. Securities Litigation,* No. CV 01-3285 (E.D.N.Y) (class recovered \$18.25 million).



- *In re Musicmaker.com Securities Litigation,* CV-00-2018 (C.D. Cal.) (class recovered \$13.75 million).
- In re Comdisco Securities Litigation, No. 01 C 2110 (MIS) (N.D. III.) (class recovered \$13.75 million).
- In re Acclaim Entertainment, Inc., Securities Litigation, C.A. No. 03-CV-1270 (E.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$13.65 million).
- *In re Concord EFS, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 02-2097 (MA) (W.D. Tenn) (class recovered \$13.25 million).
- In re Bausch & Lomb, Inc. Securities Litigation, 01 Civ. 6190 (CJS) (W.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$12.5 million).
- In re Allaire Corp. Securities Litigation, 00-11972 (D. Mass.) (class recovered \$12 million).
- Bamboo Partners LLC v. Robert Mondavi Corp., No. 26-27170 (Cal. Sup. Ct.) (class recovered \$10.8 million).
- Curative Health Services Securities Litigation, 99-2074 (E.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$10.5 million).
- City Partnership Co. v. Jones Intercable, 99 WM-1051 (D. Colo.) (class recovered \$10.5 million).
- *In re Aquila, Inc.,* (ERISA Litigation), 04-865 (W.D. Mo.) (\$10.5 million recovery for the class).
- In re Tenfold Corporation Securities Litigation, 2:00-CV-652 (D. Utah) (class recovered \$5.9 million).
- *In re Industrial Gas Antitrust Litigation*, 80 C 3479 and related cases (N.D. III.) (class recovered **\$50 million**).
- In re Chor-Alkalai and Caustic Soda Antitrust Litigation, 86-5428 and related cases (E.D. Pa.) (class recovered \$55 million).
- In re Infant Formula Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 878 (N.D. Fla.) (class recovered \$126 million).



- In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation, No. 1:94-cv-00897, M.D.L. 997 (N.D. Ill.) (class recovered \$715 million).
- Landon v. Freel, M.D.L. No. 592 (S.D. Tex.) (class recovered \$12 million).
- Holloway v. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., No. 84 C 814 EU (N.D. Okla.) (class recovered \$38 million).
- *In re The Chubb Corp.* Drought Insurance Litigation, C-1-88-644 (S.D. Ohio) (class recovered \$100 million).
- Wong v. Megafoods, Civ-94-1702 (D. Ariz.) (securities fraud) (class recovered \$12.25 million).
- In re Del Val Financial Corp. Securities Litigation, 92 Civ 4854 (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$11.5 million).
- *In re Home Shopping Network Shareholders Litigation,* Consolidated Civil Action No. 12868, (Del. Ch. 1995) (class recovered **\$13 million**).
- In re Paine Webber Limited Partnerships Litigation, 94 Civ 8547 (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$200 million).
- In re Bristol-Meyers Squibb Co. Securities Litigation, 92 Civ 4007 (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$19 million).
- In re Spectrum Information Technologies Securities Litigation, CV 93-2245 (E.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$13 million).
- *In re Chase Manhattan Securities Litigation,* 90 Civ. 6092 (LJF) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$17.5 million).
- Prostic v. Xerox Corp., No. B-90-113 (EBB) (D. Conn.) (class recovered \$9 million).
- Steiner v. Hercules, Civil Action No. 90-442-RRM (D. Del.) (class recovered \$18 million).
- In re Ambase Securities Litigation, 90 Civ 2011 (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$14.6 million).



- *In re Southmark Securities Litigation,* CA No. 3-89-1402-D (N.D. Tex.) (class recovered **\$70 million**).
- Steiner v. Ideal Basic Industries, Inc., No. 86-M 456 (D. Colo. 1989) (securities fraud) (class recovered \$18 million).
- Tucson Electric Power Derivative Litigation, 2:89 Civ. 01274 TUC. ACM (corporation recovered \$30 million).
- *Alleco Stockholders Litigation,* (Md. Cir. Ct. Pr. Georges County) (class recovered **\$16 million**).
- *In re Revlon Group, Inc. Shareholders Litigation,* No. 8362 (Del. Ch.) (class recovered \$30 million).
- *In re Taft Broadcasting Company Shareholders Litigation,* No. 8897 (Del. Ch.) (class recovered **\$20 million**).
- *In re Southland Corp. Securities Litigation,* No. 87-8834-K (N.D.Tex.) (class recovered **\$20 million**).
- In re Crocker Bank Securities Litigation, CA No. 7405 (Del. Ch.) (class recovered \$30 million).
- *In re Warner Communications Securities Litigation*, No. 82 Civ. 8288 (JFK) (S.D.N.Y.) (class recovered \$17.5 million).
- *Joseph v. Shell Oil,* CA No. 7450 (Del. Ch.) (securities fraud) (class recovered \$200 million).
- *In re Flight Transportation Corp. Securities Litigation,* Master Docket No. 4-82-874, MDL No. 517 (D. Minn.) (recovery of over \$50 million).
- In re Whittaker Corporation Securities Litigation, CA000817 (Cal. Super. Ct., Los Angeles County) (class recovered \$18 million).
- *Naevus International, Inc. v. AT&T Corp.,* C.A. No. 602191/99 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.) (consumer fraud) (class recovered **\$40 million**).
- Sewell v. Sprint PCS Limited Partnership, C.A. No. 97-188027/CC 3879 (Cir. Ct. for Baltimore City) (consumer fraud) (class recovered \$45.2 million).



- *In re Vytorin/Zetia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation,* 2:08-cv-285 (D.N.J.) (class recovered **\$41.5 million**).
- Egleston v. Verizon, No. 104784/2011 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.) Wolf Haldenstein represented a class of New York Verizon Centrex customers in an action against Verizon stemming from overbilling of certain charges. The Firm secured a settlement with a total value to the Class of over \$5 million, which provided, among other things, each class member with full refunds of certain disputed charges, plus interest.
- Zelouf Int'l Corp. v. Nahal Zelouf, Index No. 653652/2014 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co. 2015). In an important trial decision following an appraisal proceeding triggered by the freeze-out merger of a closely-held corporation, which also included shareholder derivative claims, Justice Kornreich of the New York Supreme Court refused to apply a discount for lack of marketability to the minority interest in the former corporation and found that the insiders stole more than \$14 million dollars; the minority shareholder recovered over \$9 million.
- Zelouf Int'l Corp. v. Zelouf, 45 Misc.3d 1205(A) (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co., 2014). The Court rejected application of a discount for lack of marketability and awarded a \$10,031,438.28 judgment following an eleven day bench trial in the Commercial Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York (New York County) on the value of a minority interest in a closely held corporation.



REPRESENTATIVE REPORTED OPINIONS SINCE 1990 IN WHICH WOLF HALDENSTEIN WAS LEAD COUNSEL OR HAD ANOTHER SIGNIFICANT ROLE

FEDERAL APPELLATE AND DISTRICT COURT OPINIONS

- DeFrees v. Kirkland, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 52780 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2012).
- In re Beacon Associates Litigation., 745 F. Supp. 2d 386 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); In re Beacon Associates Litig., 282 F.R.D. 315 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)
- Messner v. Northshore University HealthSystem, 669 F.3d 802, No. 10-2514 (7th Cir. Jan. 13, 2012).
- *In re Text Message Antitrust Litigation*, 630 F.3d, 622 (7th Cir. 2010).
- In re Apple & ATTM Antitrust Litig., 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 98270 (N.D. Cal. July 8, 2010).
- Freeland v. Iridium World Communications Ltd., 545 F.Supp.2d 59 (D.D.C. 2008).
- In re Apple & AT&TM Antitrust Litig., 596 F. Supp. 2d 1288 (N.D. Cal. 2008).
- Harzewski v. Guidant Corp., 489 F.3d 799 (7th Cir. 2007).
- In re JP Morgan Chase & Co. Securities Litigation, No. 06 C 4674, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93877 (N.D. III. Dec. 18, 2007).
- Schoenbaum v. E.I. Dupont De Nemours and Co., 2007 WL 2768383 (E.D. Mo. Sept. 20, 2007).
- Jeffries v. Pension Trust Fund, 99 Civ. 4174 (LMM), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61454 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 20, 2007).
- Klein v. Ryan Beck, 06-Civ. 3460 (WCC), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51465 (S.D.N.Y. July 13, 2007).
- Cannon v. MBNA Corp. No. 05-429 GMS, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48901 (D. Del. 2007).
- In re Aquila ERISA Litig., 237 F.R.D. 202 (W.D. Mo. 2006).
- Smith v. Aon Corp., 238 F.R.D. 609 (N.D. III. 2006).



- *In re Sepracor Inc. Securities Litigation*, 233 F.R.D. 52 (D. Mass. 2005).
- In re Transkaryotic Therapies, Inc. Securities Litigation, No. 03-10165, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29656 (D. Mass. Nov. 28, 2005).
- In re Luxottica Group, S.p.A. Securities Litigation, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9071 (E.D.N.Y. May 12, 2005).
- In re CNL Hotels & Resorts, Inc. Securities Litigation, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38876, No. 6:04-cv-1231-Orl-31KRS (M.D. Fla. May 9, 2005).
- Johnson v. Aegon USA, Inc., 1:01-CV-2617 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 20, 2004).
- Freeland v. Iridium World Communications, Ltd., 99-1002 (D.D.C. Aug. 31, 2004).
- In re Acclaim Entertainment, Inc. Securities Litigation, 03-CV-1270 (E.D.N.Y. June 22, 2004).
- In re Sepracor Inc. Securities Litigation, 308 F. Supp. 2d 20 (D. Mass. 2004).
- In re Concord EFS, Inc. Securities Litigation, No. 02-2697 (W.D. Tenn. Jan. 7, 2004).
- In re Pharmatrak, Inc. Privacy Litig., 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 8758 (1st Cir. May 9, 2003).
- In re Enterprise Mortgage Acceptance Co., LLC, Sec. Litig., 02-Civ. 10288 (SWK) (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 5, 2003).
- In re PerkinElmer, Inc. Securities Litigation, 286 F. Supp. 2d 46 (D. Mass. 2003).
- In re Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation, 241 F. Supp. 2d 281 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).
- In re Comdisco Securities Litigation, No. 01 C 2110, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5047 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2003).
- Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp., 257 F.3d 475 (2001), clarified, 279 F.3d 313 (5th Cir. 2002).
- City Partnership Co. v. Cable TV Fund 14-B, 213 F.R.D. 576 (D. Colo. 2002).



- In re Allaire Corporation Securities Litigation, Docket No. 00-11972 WGY, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18143 (D. Mass., Sept. 27, 2002).
- In re StarLink Corn Products Liability Litigation, 212 F.Supp.2d 828 (N.D. III. 2002).
- In re Bankamerica Corp. Securities Litigation, 263 F.3d 795 (8th Cir. 2001).
- In re Comdisco Securities Litigation, 166 F.Supp.2d 1260 (N.D. Ill. 2001).
- In re Crossroads Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation, Master File No. A-00-CA-457 JN, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14780 (W.D. Tx. Aug. 15, 2001).
- In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation, 150 F. Supp. 2d 896 (E.D. Va. 2001).
- Lindelow v. Hill, No. 00 C 3727, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10301 (N.D. Ill. July 19, 2001).
- In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation, 148 F. Supp. 2d 654 (E.D. Va. 2001).
- Jeffries v. Pension Trust Fund of the Pension, Hospitalization & Benefit Plan of the Electrical Industry, 172 F. Supp. 2d 389 (S.D.N.Y. 2001).
- Carney v. Cambridge Technology Partners, Inc., 135 F. Supp. 2d 235 (D. Mass. 2001).
- Weltz v. Lee, 199 F.R.D. 129 (S.D.N.Y. 2001).
- Schoers v. Pfizer, Inc., 00 Civ. 6121, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 511 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 23, 2001).
- Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Cos., 94 Civ. 2373 (MBM), 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 9, 2001).
- Goldberger v. Bear, Stearns & Co., 98 Civ. 8677 (JSM), 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18714 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 28, 2000).
- In re Newell Rubbermaid, Inc., Securities Litigation, Case No. 99 C 6853, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15190 (N.D. III. Oct. 2, 2000).
- Stanley v. Safeskin Corp., Case No. 99 CV 454 BTM (LSP), 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14100, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P91, 221 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2000).



- In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation, 115 F. Supp. 2d 620 (E.D. Va. 2000).
- In re USA Talks.com, Inc. Securities Litigation, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14823, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P91, 231 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 14, 2000).
- In re Sotheby's Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation, 00 CIV. 1041 (DLC), 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12504, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P91, 059 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 31, 2000).
- Dumont v. Charles Schwab & Co., Inc., Civil Action No. 99-2840 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10906 (E.D. La. July 21, 2000).
- Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp., Civil Action No. H-98-1148, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21424 (S.D. Tex. July 17, 2000).
- In re BankAmerica Corp. Securities Litigation, 95 F. Supp. 2d 1044 (E.D. Mo. 2000).
- In re Carnegie International Corp. Securities Litigation, 107 F. Supp. 2d 676 (D. Md. 2000).
- Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp., Civil Action No. H-98-1148, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21423 (S.D. Tex. Mar. 13, 2000).
- In re Imperial Credit Industries Securities Litigation, CV 98-8842 SVW, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2340 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 23, 2000).
- Sturm v. Marriott Marquis Corp., 85 F. Supp. 2d 1356 (N.D. Ga. 2000).
- In re Health Management Systems Securities Litigation, 82 F. Supp. 2d 227 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).
- Dumont v. Charles Schwab & Co., Inc., Civil Action No. 99-2840, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 619 (E.D. La. Jan. 19, 2000).
- In re MicroStrategy, Inc. Securities Litigation, 110 F. Supp. 2d 427 (E.D. Va. 2000).
- In re BankAmerica Corp. Securities Litigation, 78 F. Supp. 2d 976 (E.D. Mo. 1999).
- Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Cos., 94 Civ. 2373 (MBM), 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18378 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 24, 1999).
- In re Nanophase Technologies Corp. Litigation, 98 C 3450, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16171 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 27, 1999).



- *In re Clearly Canadian Securities Litigation,* File No. C-93-1037-VRW, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14273 Cal. Sept. 7, 1999).
- Yuan v. Bayard Drilling Technologies, Inc., 96 F. Supp. 2d 1259 (W.D. Okla. 1999).
- In re Spyglass, Inc. Securities Litigation, No. 99 C 512, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11382 (N.D. Ill. July 20, 1999).
- Carley Capital Group v. Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P., 1:97-CV-3183-TWT, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11595 (N.D. Ga. June 30, 1999).
- Blue Cross & Blue Shield of N.J., Inc. v. Philip Morris, Inc., 98 CV 3287, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11363 (E.D.N.Y. June 1, 1999).
- Carley Capital Group v. Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P., 1:97-CV-3183-TWT, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1368, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P90, 429 (N.D. Ga. Jan. 19, 1999).
- Longman v. Food Lion, Inc., 186 F.R.D. 331 (M.D.N.C. 1999).
- Wright v. Ernst & Young LLP, 152 F.3d 169 (2d Cir. 1998).
- Romine v. Compuserve Corp., 160 F.3d 337 (6th Cir. 1998).
- *Felzen v. Andreas*, 134 F.3d 873 (7th Cir. 1998).
- Walsingham v. Biocontrol Technology, Inc., 66 F. Supp. 2d 669 (W.D. Pa. 1998).
- Sturm v. Marriott Marquis Corp., 26 F. Supp. 2d 1358 (N.D. Ga. 1998).
- Carley Capital Group v. Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P., 27 F. Supp. 2d 1324 (N.D. Ga. 1998).
- In re MobileMedia Securities Litigation, 28 F.Supp.2d 901 (D.N.J. 1998).
- Weikel v. Tower Semiconductor, Ltd., 183 F.R.D. 377 (D.N.J. 1998).
- In re Health Management Systems Securities Litigation, 97 Civ. 1865 (HB), 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8061 (S.D.N.Y. May 27, 1998).
- In re Painewebber Ltd. Partnership Litigation, 999 F. Supp. 719 (S.D.N.Y. 1998).
- Carley Capital Group v. Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P., 1:97-cv-3183-TWT, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23222 (N.D. Ga. Feb. 10, 1998).



- Brown v. Radica Games (In re Radica Games Securities Litigation), No. 96-17274, 1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 32775 (9th Cir. Nov. 14, 1997).
- Robbins v. Koger Properties, 116 F.3d 1441 (11th Cir. 1997).
- In re TCW/DW North American Government Income Trust Securities Litigation, 95 Civ. 0167 (PKL), 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18485 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 20, 1997).
- Wright v. Ernst & Young, LLP, 97 Civ. 2189 (SAS), 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13630 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 9, 1997).
- Felzen v. Andreas, No. 95-2279, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23646 (C.D. Ill. July 7, 1997).
- Felzen v. Andreas, No. 95-2279, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23647 (C.D. Ill. July 7, 1997).
- A. Ronald Sirna, Jr., P.C. Profit Sharing Plan v. Prudential Securities, Inc., 964 F. Supp. 147 (S.D.N.Y. 1997).
- Kurzweil v. Philip Morris Companies, 94 Civ. 2373 (MBM), 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4451 (S.D.N.Y. April 8, 1997).
- Bobrow v. Mobilmedia, Inc., Civil Action No. 96-4715, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23806 (D.N.J. March 31, 1997).
- *Kalodner v. Michaels Stores, Inc.,* 172 F.R.D. 200 (N.D.Tex. 1997).
- In re Painewebber Ltd. Partnerships Litigation, 171 F.R.D. 104 (S.D.N.Y. 1997).
- A. Ronald Sirna, Jr., P.C. Profit Sharing Plan v. Prudential Securities, Inc., 95 Civ. 8422 (LAK), 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1226 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 7, 1997).
- In re Painewebber Inc. Limited Partnerships Litigation, 94 F.3d 49 (2d Cir. 1996).
- Glassman v. Computervision Corp., 90 F.3d 617 (1st Cir. 1996).
- Alpern v. Utilicorp United, Inc., 84 F.3d 1525 (8th Cir. 1996).
- Shaw v. Digital Equipment Corp., 82 F.3d 1194 (1st Cir. 1996).
- Dresner Co. Profit Sharing Plan v. First Fidelity Bank, N.A., 95 Civ. 1924 (MBM), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17913 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 3, 1996).



- Simon v. American Power Conversion Corp., 945 F. Supp. 416 (D.R.I. 1996).
- TII Industries, Inc., 96 Civ. 4412 (SAS), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14466 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 1, 1996).
- In re TCW/DW North American Government Income Trust Securities Litigation, 941 F. Supp. 326 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 1, 1996).
- In re Painewebber Ltd. Partnership Litigation, 94 Civ. 8547 (SHS), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9195 (S.D.N.Y. June 28, 1996).
- In re Tricord Systems, Inc., Securities Litigation, Civil No. 3-94-746, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20943 (D. Minn. April 5, 1996).
- In re Painewebber Limited Partnership Litigation, 94 Civ. 8547 (SHS), 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1265 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 6, 1996).
- Riley v. Simmons, 45 F.3d 764 (3d Cir. 1995).
- Stepak v. Addison, 20 F.3d 398 (11th Cir. 1994).
- Zitin v. Turley, [1991 Transfer Binder] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶ 96,123 (D. Ariz. June 20, 1994).
- In re Southeast Hotel Properties Limited Partnership Investor Litigation, 151 F.R.D. 597 (W.D.N.C. 1993).
- County of Suffolk v. Long Island Lighting Co., 907 F.2d 1295 (2d Cir. 1990).

WOLF HALDENSTEIN

NOTABLE STATE COURT OPINIONS

- McWilliams v. City of Long Beach, 56 Cal. 4th 613 (2013).
- Roberts v. Tishman Speyer, 89 A.D.3d 444 (N.Y. App. Div. 1st Dep't 2011).
- *Roberts v. Tishman Speyer*, 13 N.Y.3d 270 (N.Y. 2009).
- *Ardon v. City of Los Angeles,* 52 Cal.4th 241 (2011).
- *In re Tyson Foods, Inc., Consolidated Shareholder Litigation,* 919 A. 2d 563 (Del. Ch. 2007).
- Naevus Int'l v. AT&T Corp., 283 A.D.2d 171, 724 N.Y.S.2d 721 (2001).
- Paramount Communications, Inc. v. QVC Network, Inc., 637 A.2d 34 (Del. Super. Ct. 1994).
- In re Western National Corp. Shareholders Litigation, Consolidated C.A. No. 15927, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 82 (May 22, 2000).
- *In re Cencom Cable Income Partners, L.P. Litigation,* C.A. No. 14634, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 90 (May 5, 2000).
- *In re Cencom Cable Income Partners, L.P. Litigation,* Consolidated C.A. No. 14634, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 10 (Jan. 27, 2000).
- *In re Marriott Hotels Properties II Limited Partnership Unitholders Litigation,* Consolidated C.A. No. 14961, 2000 Del. Ch. LEXIS 17 (Jan. 24, 2000).
- Romig v. Jefferson-Pilot Life Insurance Company, 132 N.C. App. 682, 513 S.E.2d 598 (Ct. App. 1999), aff'd, 351 N.C. 349, 524 S.E.2d 804 (N.C. 2000).
- Wallace v. Wood, 752 A.2d 1175 (Del. Ch. 1999).
- Greenwald v. Batterson, C.A. No. 16475, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 158 (July 26, 1999).
- Brown v. Perrette, Civil Action No. 13531, 1999 Del. Ch. LEXIS 92 (May 18, 1999).
- In re Cencom Cable Income Partners, L.P. Litigation, C.A. No. 14634, 1997 Del. Ch. LEXIS 146 (Oct. 15, 1997).

WOLF HALDENSTEIN

PROVIDING EXEMPLARY LEGAL SERVICES SINCE 1888

- In re Marriott Hotel Properties II Limited Partnership Unitholders Litigation, Consolidated C.A. No. 14961, 1997 Del. Ch. LEXIS 128 (Sept. 17, 1997).
- *In re Cheyenne Software Shareholders Litigation,* Consolidated C.A. No. 14941, 1996 Del. Ch. LEXIS 142 (Nov. 7, 1996).
- Seinfeld v. Robinson, 246 A.D.2d 291, 676 N.Y.S.2d 579 (N.Y. 1998).
- Werner v. Alexander, 130 N.C. App. 435, 502 S.E.2d 897 (N.C. Ct. App. 1998).

WOLF HALDENSTEIN